



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/838,299

04/20/2001

David Kerr

19111.0055

1841

23517

7590

09/19/2006

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
3000 K STREET, NW
BOX 1P
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

NGUYEN BA, PAUL H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/838,299

Applicant(s)

KERR ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Nguyen-Ba

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-14 and 16-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-14, and 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This action is responsive to Applicant's Amendments and Remarks filed on 6/21/2006.
2. Claims 1, 2, 4-14, and 16-19 are currently pending. Claims 1, 8, 14, and 17 are independent claims.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 14, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cavendish et al. ("Cavendish"), U.S. Patent No. 5,408,659, in view of Jordan, U.S. Patent No. 4,982,344.

Regarding independent claim 1, Cavendish teaches:

A method for defining a link between first and second applications windows on a processing system (see Abstract), the processing system having a database (see Fig. 2; col. 7, lines 25-28) and at least one remote end station (col. 5, lines 61-66 → CPU with connected display device) coupled to the database a communications system, operating the end station so as to:

- *display a first applications window (see Fig. 3; col. 8, lines 1-14);*
- *cause the processing system to enter a link defining mode and display second applications window, thereby causing the processing system to define link between the first and second applications windows; in response to displaying the second applications window; (see Figs. 3-6; col. 7 line 62 to col. 8 line 61: **Link pane class application framework** enables implementation of a link defining mode wherein a user may define a link between a first and second application window by dragging the icon display to the respective locations in either the first or second application window); and*
- *generate link data defining the link, the link data being stored on the database (see Fig. 2; col. 7, lines 25-28: Cavendish teaches a relational database).*

Cavendish does not explicitly teach wherein "*the causing of the processing system to display the second applications window*" causes the processing system to display the second applications window. However, Jordan teaches a link creation unit for linking data units of a data structure (i.e., window applications) (see Abstract). A user enters a link-defining mode and causes the system to display the linked second window by selecting an Auto Link button in the first window (see Fig. 9 and col. 18 lines 20-51).

Since both references are from the same field of endeavor, the motivational purpose of accelerating link creation between windows as disclosed by Jordan would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Cavendish. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Cavendish with the teachings of Jordan to include wherein "*the causing of the processing system to display the second applications window*" causes the processing system to display the second applications window.

Regarding claim 4, Cavendish, in view of Jordan, further teach the link being defined to allow the second applications window to be displayed directly from the first applications window (see Figs. 3-6; col. 8, lines 10-61 → simply drag the icon representing the second application onto the first application window using the click-and-drag method to all second applications window to be displayed directly from the first applications window).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Cavendish, in view of Jordan, further teach presenting the link (defined as an icon) within the first applications window (see Figs. 3 and 6; col. 8, lines 23-31 → an object which associates a point in one object with a point in another object is called a link).

Regarding independent claims 8, 14, and 17, please refer to the rationale relied upon to reject substantially similar subject matter in independent claim 1.

Regarding claims 2 and 10, please refer to the rationale relied upon to reject substantially similar subject matter in independent claim 1.

Regarding claim 9, Cavendish, in view of Jordan, further teach displaying the applications window on a display of the end station (see Figs. 3-6).

Regarding claim 18, Cavendish, in view of Jordan, further teach a database storing applications data associated with the first and second applications windows (see Fig. 2; col. 7, lines 25-28 → relational database).

6. **Claims 7, 11-13, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cavendish et al. ("Cavendish"), U.S. Patent No. 5,408,659, in view of Jordan, U.S. Patent No. 4,982,344, in further view of Cragun, U.S. Patent No. 6,177,936.**

Regarding claims 7, 11, 16, and 19, Cavendish, in view of Jordan, teach a method and processing system for defining a link between first and second applications windows on a processing system (see Abstract), the processing system having a database (see Fig. 2; col. 7, lines 25-28) and at least one remote end station (col. 5, lines 61-66 → CPU with connected display device) coupled to the database a communications system with respect to independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 17 as discussed above.

Cavendish does not specifically teach the use of a *respective identifier, wherein the link data is stored in accordance with the respective user identifier such that each user can define respective links.*

However, Cragun teaches a system and method for providing contextual information for multiple windows wherein a user profile is maintained for the purpose of storing a user's preferences for use at a later date (see Figs. 8 and 9; col. 8, lines 27-33).

Since Cavendish, Jordan, and Cragun are from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Cragun would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Cavendish, in view of Jordan. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Cavendish, in view of Jordan, with the teachings of Cragun to include a user profile, identified by an identifier, for storing the link defining preferences of the user for the purpose of storing a user's preferences for use at a later date.

Regarding claim 12, Cavendish, in view of Jordan, teach the processing system with respect to claim 10 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach the storing the link data in the database in accordance with the user password.

However, Cragun teaches a system and method for providing contextual information for multiple windows wherein a user profile is maintained for the purpose of storing a *particular* user's preferences for use at a later date (see Figs. 8 and 9; col. 8, lines 27-33).

It was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art to use passwords to ensure that only the appropriate user can access the database storing his/her profile. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to include a user password for the purpose of accessing a particular user profile in a database.

Regarding claim 13, Cavendish, in view of Jordan, teach the processing system with respect to claim 12 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach the end station processor being adapted to receive and transfer the user identifier to the center processor, and the center processor being adapted to transfer any link data stored in the database.

However, Cragun teaches a system and method for providing contextual information for multiple windows wherein a user profile is maintained for the purpose of storing a *particular* user's preferences for use at a later date (see Figs. 8 and 9; col. 8, lines 27-33).

It was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art to provide a processor adapted to receive and transfer a user identifier to a center processor to transfer data stored in a database for the purpose of providing storing and providing access to link definitions to the appropriate user. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to provide a processor adapted to receive and transfer a user identifier to a center processor to transfer data stored in a database for the purpose of providing storing and providing access to link definitions to the appropriate user.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims filed on 6/21/2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The new ground of rejection includes the addition of the Jordan patent, which is being relied upon for teaching the newly added limitation, wherein "*the causing of the processing system to display the second applications window*" causes the processing system to display the second applications window. Applicant's arguments focus on the prior art's failure to teach this particular limitation. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated at the time of the invention to arrive at the instant invention by combining Cavendish and Jordan.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4094. The examiner can normally be reached on 11 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PNB


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100